RICHARD HURD'S *LETTERS ON CHIVALRY AND ROMANCE*

A Portion of

RICHARD HURD: BISHOP, ESSAYIST, AND CRITIC

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

BY

AUDLEY L. SMITH

BALTIMORE

1939

RICHARD HURD'S *LETTERS ON CHIVALRY AND ROMANCE*

A Portion of

RICHARD HURD: BISHOP, ESSAYIST, AND CRITIC

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

BY

AUDLEY L. SMITH

BALTIMORE

1939

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Part I. The Life and Works of Richard Hurd

Chapter I. The Life of Richard Hurd
Chapter II. The Horace
Chapter III. Hurd, Warburton, and the Controversial Tracts
Chapter IV. Moral and Political Dialogues

Part II. A Study in Criticism

Chapter I. The Critic
Chapter II. The Art of Poetry
Chapter III. On Poetical Imitation
Chapter IV. The Drama
Chapter V. Letters on Chivalry and Romance

Conclusion

Appendix I. The poetry of Richard Hurd

Appendix II. Hurd's Views on the Eighteenth-Century Novelists and Their Works

Appendix III. English Criticism of Tasso and Ariosto

Appendix IV. Hurd's Indebtedness to Sainte-Palaye

Bibliography

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547016_0152

THESIS SUMMARY

This study seeks a better understanding of Richard Hurd (1720-1808)—his personality, his relations with his contemporaries, and his views on some of the more important subjects that interested his century. It is especially concerned with his critical theories and endeavors to determine his position in the history of literary criticism.

Hurd was a prominent figure in ecclesiastical and literary circles. A smug, conventional Briton, he was completely satisfied with his country, its civilization, and its institutions; he wished no alterations in them. He vigorously defended the Anglican creeds and dogma; firmly believed in the Establishment; and attacked deists and Methodists as dangerous enemies of the church. He was convinced that Britain's universities, "in their present form," are well enough calculated to meet all the ends" of such institutions. With the British form of government he was equally well pleased. Both tyranny and democracy were hateful to him. Only under a limited monarchy can a people enjoy true liberty.

As a critic of literature, Hurd is representative of his age. His Augustan predecessors gave him a conception of the function of criticism—to confirm established rules or discover new ones—and an exaggerated respect for rules and genre. Many of his critical opinions, too, are in harmony with the neo-classical age. Prominent are his views that the poet must be guided by common sense and reason and must not surpass the bounds of nature, and that imitations of earlier works reflect no discredit on the imitator.

Longinus and Aristotle, especially the latter, determined in large measure Hurd's critical system. But he did not regard the precepts of Aristotle as necessarily synonymous with the dictates of nature and reason; when he found them incompatible, he rejected the Stagyrite.

Hurd's critical system, however, contrasts with the Augustans in some of its essential features. Among the important differences is the substitution of an inductive, scientific method for the *a priori* reasoning from authority.

The *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* (1762) is Hurd's most valuable contribution. Quite properly it has been heralded as a pioneer work in the "romantic movement" in criticism. It recognizes the value of imagination, legitimatizes the use of supernatural events and marvelous occurrences, and proclaims the Gothic manners and superstitions superior to the classic for the purposes of poetry. It also reflects an appreciation of Spenser and the Italian renaissance poets that is based on the romantic features of their epics. These and other scarcely less significant views embodied in the *Letters* contrast sharply with opinions expressed in his earlier dissertations and identify Hurd with the revolution in taste and criticism that paralleled the early stages of the romantic movement in creative literature.

[Reprinted from *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History,* Vol. 6, No. 1, March, 1939.]

RICHARD HURD'S *LETTERS ON CHIVALRY AND ROMANCE*

By Audley L. Smith

Having vigorously defended for more than a decade the orthodox classical precepts of his day,[1] Richard Hurd finally yielded to the romantic spell of the "far away and long ago" and in 1762 offered his one important contribution to the renascence of interest in the mediaeval. The contribution—a collection of twelve letters to which the author gave the title *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*—provides critical justification for the literature of the Middle Ages and the use of romance material in modern poetry by insisting that the chivalric manners and Gothic superstitions are more poetic than those of the Greek heroic age; by arguing that the greatness of Spenser and the Italian renaissance poets lies in the romantic rather than the classical features of their epics; and by defending imagination and the "fairy way of writing."

Seldom has the historical method in criticism been employed more effectively or to better advantage than it is by Hurd in his efforts to discover the "latent causes" of chivalry and the mediaeval romances and, in so doing, to exonerate the "barbarians" from the charges of "caprice" and "absurdity" that his own age was too ready to bring against them. "Nothing in human nature is without its reasons," he tells us in Letter I. If we would understand the romances, we must know the institution of chivalry which gave birth to them; if we would understand chivalry, we must know from what causes it was derived—the "wants, designs, and policies" of the barbarians among whom it rose must be explored. Wherefore, Hurd employs one of his favorite critical methods, that of explaining phenomena as the inevitable results of causes which lie in the social, economic, and political conditions of the age, and discovers that chivalry was an unavoidable consequence of the feudal system, that certain features inevitably characterized

[1] In his Notes and Commentaries on Horace's *Ars Poetica* (first ed., 1749) and *Epistle to Augustus* (first ed., 1751), and in the following discourses: *On Poetical Imitation* (1751), *On the Provinces of the Drama* (1753), *On the Marks of Imitation* (1757).

chivalry as an institution, and that these features necessarily determined the distinguishing characteristics of the mediaeval romances.

From this investigation of the origin and characteristics of chivalry (Letters II, III), the author turns to the " remarkable correspondency between the manners of the old heroic times, as painted by their great romancer, Homer, and those which are represented to us in the books of knight-errantry." (Letters IV, V.) The parallels, which extend even to resemblances between the Greek heroes and the mediaeval knights, provide Hurd with one of the most telling arguments he could offer his eighteenth-century readers who were willing to accept Homer but had only contempt for the tales of chivalry:

> When we see a sort of Chivalry springing up among the Greeks, who were confessedly in a state resembling that of the feudal barons, and attended by the like symptoms and effects, is it not fair to conclude that the Chivalry of the Gothic times was owing to that common corresponding state, and received its character from it?

Had Hurd rested his case without further argument his jury of eighteenth-century readers could scarcely have failed to exonerate chivalry and the " spirit of romance " from the charges of absurdity and caprice. Chivalry as an institution resulted inevitably from the social and political conditions of the age in which it was born; the mediaeval romancers do not depart from nature, rather they faithfully interpret their own age, its customs, manners, superstitions; the manners and the poetry of the barbarians are strikingly similar to those of the ancient Greeks. A stronger defense, granting the soundness of the argument, could not have been employed in the eighteenth century.

But the author of the *Letters* is not satisfied merely to defend chivalry and romance. In Letter VI he drops the defensive attitude and boldly brings his comparisons of Greek and Gothic manners to a climax with the assertions that the circumstances in which the two differ " are clearly to the advantage of the Gothic designers " and that the manners and superstitions of the Middle Ages are " the more poetical for being Gothic." This, of course, is heresy; for that matter, the entire letter is one heresy after another. It characterizes the early Grecian age as one of " simple and uncontrolled barbarity." It draws a

comparison between the *Iliad* and the mediaeval romances which favors the latter because of their " beauty, novelty, and pathos." It finds the Gothic superstitions more poetical than the Greek and Roman for the very romantic reason that they more powerfully stimulate the imagination. The " magic and necromancy " of Ovid, Seneca, and Lucan are as nothing when compared to the " dire superstitions " of the mediaeval romancers, who had a distinct advantage in the richness of the material available to them: the " gloomy visions of daemons and spirits which spring out of the Alexandrine or Platonic philosophy "; the Christian superstition with its " system of magic and all its supernumerary horrors "; and, most dire of all, the superstitions which " took their birth in the frozen regions of the north . . . conceived in the imagination of a people involved in tenfold darkness . . . in the thickest shades of ignorance, as well as the gloom of the comfortless woods and forests." Drawn from these sources, the " Gothic witchcraft and incantations," and even the " current popular tales of elves and fairies," are far more effective in charming us into a " willing admiration of the specious miracles which wayward fancy delights in " than are " all the traditionary rabble of pagan divinities." Their power cannot well be demonstrated to the reason; it must be conceived by the imagination.

Although none of the mediaeval romancers were, in Hurd's opinion, fitted to give artistic expression to the age of chivalry, the works of Spenser, Milton, and Shakespeare prove the Gothic manners and superstitions to be more poetical than the classic. Spenser " could have planned, no doubt, an heroic design on the exact classic model " or he might have " trimmed between the Gothic and classic," as Tasso did, but the " charms of fairy prevailed." As a Gothic, not a classical poem, the *Faerie Queene* is to be read and criticized.

Hurd recognizes two types of poetry, as well as two types of architecture: Grecian and Gothic. Each is governed by its own set of rules and can be appreciated and criticized only by them. His critique of the *Faerie Queene* (Letter VIII)), therefore, is devoted, in large measure, to setting forth and explaining these laws. His concern is primarily with the question of unity, partially because, to him, unity is the first essential of all poetry, and partially, no doubt, because Spenser's poem had been frequently censured on this score.

That there were no rules for the Gothic epic which he could take from some authority and apply to the *Faerie Queene* places Hurd at no disadvantage. The *a priori* reasoning from authority is not characteristic of his critical method. Rather, he derives his laws from nature and "the reason of the thing." Accordingly, in his examination of the *Faerie Queene* he proclaims "its method as well as the other characteristics of its composition" to have been derived from "the established modes and ideas of chivalry," and in these "modes and ideas" he finds his laws for the Gothic epic, especially its unity, and his justification of Spenser's masterpiece.

The method of the *Faerie Queene* was determined by an actual custom in the days of chivalry: the feasting for twelve days, each of which "was distinguished by the claim and allowance of some adventure." What better reason, inquires Hurd, could be desired for Spenser's method? *Twelve* knights are as essential to the poem as one hero is to the *Odyssey*. So far as the unity of the work is concerned, it is immaterial whether one or twelve heroes figure in the action. Classical unity "consists in the representation of one entire action"; Gothic unity results from "the respect which a number of related actions have to one common purpose." The former is a unity of action; the latter, a unity of design. The unity of the *Faerie Queene*, a Gothic poem, consists in "the relation of its several adventures to one common original, the appointment of the Fairy Queen; and to one common end, the completion of the Fairy Queene's injunction."

The significance of Hurd's discussion of the subject lies in his refusal to follow the earlier critics of Spenser, who, approaching the question of unity from a classical point of view, had demanded an epic hero for the *Faerie Queene*. In consequence, they either had exaggerated the importance of Arthur or had condemned the poem for its lack of unity—Spenser should have written twelve separate poems or have given Arthur the leading part in each book. If the author of the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* bases his justification of Spenser on a law for Gothic unity which seems arbitrary, he at least takes an important step forward in recognizing that the poem may be approved without any reservation as to its unity or any exaggeration of the part which Arthur

has in the action. Arthur is, in Hurd's opinion, non-essential. Spenser added him as an afterthought and would have done better to omit him. Unfortunately the author of the *Faerie Queene,* yielding to the influence of the classics, endeavored to give his poem a semblance of classical unity by " interweaving the several actions together, in order to give something like the appearance of one action to his twelve adventures " and by " adopting one superior character, which should be seen throughout." These expedients were injudicious. They attempted " to ally two things in nature incompatible; the effect of which misalliance was to discover and expose the nakedness of the Gothic."

But the poem is allegorical as well as narrative. For the purpose of the allegory Arthur is essential, though he destroys in a measure the unity of design of the narrative, and Spenser is quite right in not making him the principal character in each book. If Arthur had possessed the twelve virtues in the degree in which each knight had his own, he would have been a " monster." As an allegorical poem, the method of the *Faerie Queene* is governed by " the justness of the moral "; as a narrative poem, " it is conducted in the ideas and usages of chivalry." " In either view," adds Hurd, " if taken by itself, the plan is defensible. But from the union of the two designs there arises a perplexity and confusion, which is the proper, and only considerable defect of this extraordinary poem." Not even in Spenser's masterpiece can Hurd condone the mixing of genre.

From his study of Spenser, Hurd turns to Tasso and Ariosto (Letter X) and discovers further evidence of " the pre-eminence of Gothic manners and fictions as adapted to the ends of poetry." The climax is reached in this letter. Intended primarily to counteract the influence of those critics who were hostile to the Italians, its significance is by no means limited to its defense of Italian poetry. It reasserts the author's belief that the Gothic charms and magic are more poetical than the classic; it challenges the " trite maxim of following nature "; it insists that the marvelous is a *sine qua non* of epic poetry; and it defends the " fairy way of writing " and declares that Tasso's epic merits a second reading solely because of its " Gothic lyes."

The letter opens with an endeavor to demonstrate that,

contrary to the assertions of hostile critics, the supernatural occurrences in the Italian epics are not without a basis in truth. But even if they lacked this foundation, the charge that they are beyond the bounds of possibility would have little merit, for it is based on the false supposition that the poets are so unreasonable as to expect their lies to be believed, whereas " they think it enough if they can but bring you to imagine the possibility of them." The basis of their " air-formed visions " need be no more than " a legend, a tale, a tradition, a rumour, a superstition." Nor does the reader demand truth or even credibility. " He is best pleased when he is made to conceive (he minds not by what magic) the existence of such things as his reason tells him did not, and never were likely to, exist."

Hurd, however, is by no means willing to justify the " fairy way of writing " without circumscribing the poet's imagination. His " air-formed visions " may defy reason and possibility but they must, at least, have a basis in popular beliefs and superstitions. " We must distinguish," he cautions us, " between *popular* belief and that of the reader. The fictions of poetry do, in some degree at least, require the *first* (they would otherwise pass for dreams indeed)." [2]

But the restriction weakens little Hurd's plea for a recognition of the validity of imagination in poetry. " A poet, they say, must follow nature; and by nature we are to suppose can only be meant the known and experienced course of affairs in the world." The poet, however, has " a world of his own, where experience has less to do than consistent imagination." He has, too, a supernatural world, with " Gods, Fairies, and Witches at his command." So it is that, in the poet's world, " all is marvellous and extraordinary; yet not unnatural in one sense, as it agrees to the conceptions that are readily entertained of these magical and wonder-working natures."

In the concluding letter of his discourse Hurd traces briefly the revolution in taste that brought the romances into disrepute. The tales of chivalry began as images of feudal manners, " magnified and distorted by unskilful designers." When common sense became offended with these perversions of truth, the poets were forced to resort to allegory and to pretend that

[2] The italics are Hurd's.

their knights and giants were " but the cover to abundance of profound wisdom." But the seventeenth century would not tolerate the romances, even though they were disguised as allegory. Reason had gained the ascendancy over imagination and dealt the death blow to chivalry and romance. Poetry has suffered from this revolution in taste. Something may have been gained but much has been lost:

> What we have gotten by this revolution, you will say, is a great deal of good sense. What we have lost is a world of fine fabling; the illusion of which is so grateful to the charmed spirit, that in spite of philosophy and fashion, Fairy Spenser still ranks highest among the poets, I mean with all those who are either come of that house or have kindness for it.[3]

A comparison of the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* with Hurd's earlier discourses reveals numerous changes in the author's critical opinions. Important among them are the recognition of the value of poetic imagination and the accompanying interpretation of nature. Both are new with Hurd. It is significant, however, that he refuses to abandon the truth-to-nature precept, which, if we may judge by his earlier writings, had always been one of his most important critical standards. Throughout the *Letters*, Hurd's conception of the poet's duty to nature is everywhere apparent. Nature is invoked in defense of the institution of chivalry and the Gothic superstitions. The epics of the Italians and Spenser are commended as reflections of nature; the mediaeval romancers are condemned for distorting her.

As regards nature as a critical standard, the contrast with Hurd's earlier writings is in the interpretation. The challenge in Letter X is to the " trite maxim " which restricts the poet to the " known and experienced course of affairs in the world." His own interpretation of nature is a broader one. It extends the bounds of nature to include popular beliefs and superstitions; it admits those marvelous occurrences and supernatural agents which, " though daring to depart from sober truth, are still to nature true." [4] This gives to nature a meaning not to be found in Hurd's earlier writings and, consequently, offers greater

[3] Letter XII. The italics are Hurd's.

[4] William Collins, "An Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland," lines 189-90.

concessions to poetic imagination. But Hurd has not discarded nature as a standard nor removed the limitations that his new understanding of poetic truth places upon the poet's "air-formed visions." It is the privilege, even the duty, of the epic poet to arouse wonder through the marvelous,[5] but his "divine dreams" and "delirious fancy" must not carry him beyond the bounds of nature; Hurd in his most romantic moments could not have approved of *Kubla Kahn* or the creations of Edgar Allen Poe. He, therefore, had condemned, in his earlier writings, the sorceries of Ovid,[6] not because they depart from "sober truth," but because they do not restrain themselves within the bounds of "nature," as Hurd interprets the term. Shakespeare, on the other hand, wisely adopted the popular system of fairies for his pastorals;[7] all the amazing flights of his imagination and of Homer's are "found agreeable to nature when contemplated by the capable reader."[8]

Although Hurd had never refused the poet permission to introduce the supernatural, so long as he did not surpass the limits of popular beliefs, poetic imagination comes into its own only with the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* and the later discourse "On the Idea of Universal poetry."[9] In Hurd's critical system, reason, common sense, and nature had been far more important; imagination had received scant consideration. Never had he suggested any regret at the loss of "a world of fine fabling." With the *Letters,* imagination becomes an important standard—so important that, in recognition of its value, Hurd grants the poet a world of his own in which the imagination may have free rein; and proclaims the Gothic superstitions to be more poetical than those of the age of Homer. Furthermore, his conversion to the more romantic view appears to have been permanent, for in his last critical essay, "The Idea of Universal Poetry," he declares fiction to be the soul of poetry

[5] This Hurd had always recognized. He insisted, in his "Discourse on Poetical Imitation," that supernatural agents are essential to epic poetry since through them the poet arouses the wonder of his readers. He, therefore, censured Davenant for excluding the supernatural from *Gondibert.*

[6] Notes on Horace's "Art of Poetry" (Hurd's *Works,* 1811 ed., l. 144).

[7] *Ibid.,* 214. [8] *Ibid.,* 158.

[9] Aisso Bosker (*Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson,* The Hague, 1930, pp. 214, 218.) mistakenly assumes that this essay antedated the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance.* On the contrary, "The Idea of Universal Poetry" was first published in 1764.

and urges the poet to address himself to our "wildest fancy" rather than to our "judgment and cooler sense." [10]

The appreciation of the poetic values of the Gothic romance materials and the miraculous events of the renaissance epics is also at variance with Hurd's earlier views. Gothic manners and superstitions he had not regarded as worthy of serious consideration; much less had he believed them to be superior to the classic. His few references to them reflect only disapproval and contempt. He commended Davenant for carefully excluding the prodigies and enchantments of the mediaeval romancers; [11] Milton he censured for drawing many of his allusions from "the rubbish of every silly legend or romance that had come to his knowledge." [12] In his *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, however, Hurd approves in Milton a "certain predilection for the legends of chivalry before the fables of Greece." That both he and Spenser favored the Gothic should, Hurd believes, "incline us to think with more respect than is commonly done of Gothic manners, I mean as adapted to the use of greater poetry." (Letter X.)

The unorthodoxy of the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* was immediately recognized by a contributor to the *Monthly Review*, who commended Hurd for daring to think for himself and opening "a new vein of criticism." [13] Modern scholars have agreed with this and have heralded the *Letters* as an important contribution to the eighteenth-century revolution in literary criticism which substituted new and more liberal standards for those of the neo-classicists. One or two students of Hurd have even over-stated the case. Harko G. De Maar, for instance, characterizes the *Letters* as the first important work "in which critical views of modern romanticism were developed" [14] and Edith Morley incorrectly asserts that the opening sentence in Hurd's treatise—"The Ages we call barbarous present us with many a subject of curious speculation"—offers a new and hitherto undreamed-of point of view." [15]

Admittedly Hurd's discourse is out of harmony with mid-

[10] *Works*, 1811 ed., 2. 6.
[11] "On Poetical Imitation," *Works*, 2. 238-9.
[12] *Ibid.* 202.
[13] Vol. 27 (August, 1762). 81.
[14] *A History of Modern Romanticism* (London, 1924), p. 230.
[15] Morley ed., *Hurd's Letters on Chivalry and Romance* (London, 1911), p. 7.

eighteenth-century neo-classicism in its purpose and its subjects and in many of the critical opinions that it embodies. But Hurd was not the first eighteenth-century scholar to regard the Middle Ages as worthy of serious investigation and discussion nor the first to stress the importance of imagination to poetry and to recognize the poetic values of the renaissance epics.

It was in his insistence upon the superiority of Gothic manners over classic for the purpose of modern poetry that Hurd was the most original and the most anti-neo-classical. Yet this is by no means the only feature of the *Letters* that conflicts with traditional views. The sympathetic interest in Gothic manners and chivalry; the defense of the structure and the miraculous occurrences of the *Faerie Queene*; the high praise of Tasso and Ariosto; the interpretation of nature which gives a freedom to the poet's imagination; the regret that common sense and reason have deprived us of "a world of fine fabling" and the implied preference for the poetry of the Elizabethans to that of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: all of these contribute to the importance of the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* as a pioneer work. No one is original with Hurd, but all are opposed to earlier Augustan views and attitudes, and many were rare in the mid-eighteenth century.

More common, of course, was the historical point of view. English critics had long been aware of the influence of geography and climate, of customs, religion, and political conditions on the literature of a people. With the advance of the eighteenth century the scientific approach to problems of criticism, which was replacing the *a priori* reasoning from authority, and the realization that the historical method could be effectively introduced in behalf of Shakespeare gave impetus to the growth of the historical point of view. By the middle of the century it was so widely accepted that Thomas Warton's declaration, "It is absurd to think of judging Ariosto and Spenser by precepts they did not attend to,"[16] was not at all heretical in its protest against the method of the more rigid neo-classicists. Scarcely more than commonplaces were Joseph Warton's and Samuel Johnson's expressions of the view that an

[16] *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser* (1762 ed.), l. 15.

understanding of the poet's environment is essential to an appreciation of his genius.[17]

There is nothing unusual, then, in Hurd's insistence that Spenser must not be judged by classical rules and that a proper evaluation of chivalry must rest on a knowledge of the "rise, progress, and genius of Gothic Chivalry" and "the circumstances of the Gothic fictions and manners." Nor is his the only mid-eighteenth century study of early literature that was motivated by this conception of the relationship between the poet's genius and the age in which he wrote. An endeavor to understand the genius of Homer led Thomas Blackwell into a lengthy study of ancient Greece,[18] and Robert Wood traveled to Greece in order that he might read the various portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* "in the same order, in the same light, and under the same point of view in which I imagine they presented themselves to the poet's choice."[19] An even nearer approach to Hurd's *Letters* is Thomas Warton's study of Spenser and the Italians, undertaken in the belief that, in reading an author, we should "place ourselves in his situation and circumstances."[20]

The *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* does, however, represent an important contribution to the growth of the historical method in criticism. To study the Greek dramatists and Homer, whose genius no one questioned, or to employ it in behalf of Shakespeare, whom Englishmen in the age of Johnson were vigorously defending against the attacks of Voltaire, was one thing; to examine "the ages we call barbarous" and discover therein the justification for poetry not highly regarded in the eighteenth century was another. Critics had not grasped the full import of the historical method. They had failed to realize that poetry so different from eighteenth-century standards as the mediaeval romances may interpret life as truly as do the writings of Homer and Virgil; that "barbarians" do indeed "have their own reason" and that an investigation of their customs and manners, their religious and political systems may disclose something "peculiarly suited to the view of

[17] Johnson, Preface to Shakespeare (Literary Club ed.), 12.13; Warton, *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope* (1806 ed.), 1.5.

[18] *An Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735).

[19] *Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer* (London, 1775), p. 5. First ed., 1767.

[20] *Observations on the Faerie Queene* (1754 ed.), p. 217.

genius." Even those who had invoked the historical point of view in defense of Shakespeare [21] had seldom revealed a sympathetic understanding of his age. Either, like Johnson, they had been satisfied merely to assert that a poet must be considered in relation to his age, or, like Elizabeth Montagu, they had described Shakespeare's background in such terms as " dark shades of Gothic barbarism " and " passion of civil rage and discord." [22]

Among the English critics, Thomas Warton alone preceded Hurd in erecting a defense for Spenser and the Italian poets on a study of the age of chivalry, but the *Letters* marks a distinct advance over the first (1754) edition of Warton's *Observations*—the only edition that ante-dated it. Not only is Hurd more sympathetic with Gothic manners and superstitions but his conception of their importance to poetry is broader. Warton was concerned primarily with Spenser and the Italians; he was interested in chivalry and Gothic customs only in so far as they explain the poets whom he sought to justify. Hurd's was a larger problem: whether there may not be " something in the Gothic Romance peculiarly suited to the views of genius and to the ends of poetry." His task leads him into an extensive study of chivalry and Gothic manners. He applies the historical method even to Gothic witchcrafts and enchantments and finds in the climate and natural environment of the northern tribes the reason for the " superior solemnity of their superstitions." Through his study, Gothic manners and superstitions are demonstrated to be more poetical than those of the Greeks and Romans—a view that not even Warton had suggested. Spenser and the Italians are justified and Shakespeare requires no apology for his use of Gothic superstitions; he is greater when he uses Gothic manners and machinery than when he employs the classical." (Letter VII.)

In his attitude toward the mediaeval romances, for which he had no liking,[23] Hurd was in agreement with his contemporaries,

[21] From Farquhar and Pope down through the century the historical method was frequently employed in behalf of Shakespeare.

[22] *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Shakespeare* (London, 1772), p. 150.

[23] " Not that I shall make a merit with you in having perused these barbarous volumes," writes Hurd, addressing Yorke; " much less would I impose the ungrateful task upon you. Thanks to the curiosity of certain painful collectors, this material is to be obtained at a cheaper rate." (Letter IV.)

though his sympathetic attitude toward chivalry was more unusual. The historians, it is true, were, for the most part, not unfriendly in their treatment of chivalry as an institution, though Hume could find no more friendly epithets than "affectations," "conceits," and "fopperies" when he characterized it.[24] But few of the critics perceived the poetic value of the chivalric romances. Warburton was not at all sympathetic in his discussion of the rise of chivalry and the romances;[25] Smollett bitterly denounced both and proclaimed his gratitude to Cervantes for exposing them;[26] Johnson, in his Preface to Shakespeare, apologized for Shakespeare's employment of "strange events" and "fabulous transactions" in terms that leave no doubt of his own disapproval of romance materials, even though he was a reader of romances.

The view which most nearly corresponds to Hurd's is that of a contributor to *The Library*. He admits that the spirit of chivalry "may be considered in a barbarous period as favorable to the cultivation and refinement of the human mind" and that the chivalric code "could not fail in the end of giving birth to poetry and other elegant arts." Yet he discovers in the mediaeval romances proof that "literature is of no avail without taste."[27] As contrasted with Hurd, however, he finds the mediaeval writers to be "as despicable for the matter as for the expression."[28]

Because he was conscious of the importance of imagination to poetry and because his conception of nature included not only the possible, but whatever is accepted by popular belief, Hurd perceived in the romance material poetic values that escaped his contemporaries and predecessors. Not that he was the first or the only eighteenth-century essayist to admit supernatural occurrences to epic poetry. From Homer down to Hurd's own day religious machinery had been accepted; long before the mid-eighteenth century elements in no way associated with religion had been legitimatized by the interpretation of nature which Hurd presents in the *Letters*;[29] and throughout the

[24] *History of England* (London, 1764), 4. 338.

[25] *Supplement to the Translator's Preface*, Jarvis's translation of *Don Quixote*.

[26] *Preface to Roderick Random*.

[27] *The Library, or Moral and Critical Magazine*, 2 (January, 1762). 31.

[28] Ibid. 2 (March, 1762). 127.

[29] Dryden, for example, in his *Heroic Poetry and Poetic License* (1677) gave an early expression to Hurd's view.

century the popular-beliefs theory is frequently employed to extend the bounds of nature. But few of Hurd's contemporaries were willing to go so far as Maurice Morgann, who asserted that "true poetry is magic, not nature,"[30] or John Ogilvie, who anticipated Coleridge's "willing suspension of disbelief" by permitting the poet to disregard nature entirely: "When the rules of credibility are once wholly violated, an author . . . ought to set no bounds to the excursions of fancy."

Briefly, then, Hurd's interpretation of nature was not unusual in the eighteenth century nor was his attitude toward the marvelous and supernatural in poetry at all heretical. Like many of his contemporaries, he took a position mid-way between Blackwell and Gentleman, who were unwilling to admit the supernatural to poetry,[32] on the one hand, and Morgann and Ogilvie, on the other. And yet, as contrasted with the many critics who held opinions similar to his, Hurd represents an advance toward a more liberal view in that he not only defended miraculous occurrences and supernatural agents and regarded them as essential to epic poetry, but he found them to be more poetical than events which lie within the realm of possibility; he discovered in the Gothic a richer and more poetic vein of superstitions than in the Homeric age; he regretted that Tasso diluted the Gothic with a mixture of the classical.

With the recognition of the value of the marvelous in poetry came a re-evaluation and new appreciation of the Italian poets, based on studies that emphasized their fictions rather than the structure and allegory of their epics. In this movement Hurd stands well in the vanguard. Diametrically opposed to the views of the earlier critics are his contentions that the fairy tales of Tasso do him more honor than the classical parts of his poem; that his imitations of the ancients are faint and cold when compared with his Gothic fictions; and that the principal merit of the *Jerusalem Delivered* is its "lyes of Gothic invention." Likewise opposed to the neo-classical view is his recogni-

[30] *An Essay on the Dramatic Character of John Falstaff* (London, 1777), p. 71.
[31] *Philosophical and Critical Observations* (London, 1777), 1. 130.
[32] Thomas Blackwell, *An Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (London, 1736), p. 70; Francis Gentleman, *The Dramatic Censor* (London, 1770), 1. 80.

tion of the genius of Ariosto who, by Hurd's standards, is superior to Tasso in at least one respect: his pure Gothicism as opposed to Tasso's mixture of Gothic and classical. Small wonder, then, that Hurd attacked with some bitterness the French and English critics of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries for their harsh treatment of the Italians.[33]

Furthermore, in its contribution to the new appreciation of the Italian renaissance epics which distinguished the third quarter of the eighteenth century from the Augustan age, Hurd's discourse is a pioneer work. Aside from the writings of the Italian critic Baretti, it was the first detailed sympathetic study of Tasso and Ariosto; the first critical treatise to reflect an enthusiasm for their poetry based on an appreciation of its Gothic elements.[34] Even among Hurd's contemporaries the Italians had received scant attention before 1762 and the more friendly of their critics with the exception of Collins,[35] had found their excellences to consist in qualities not at all romantic. If, then, Hurd does not differ essentially from those eighteenth-century critics who were the most enthusiastic in their reactions to the Italians, his contribution is an important one in pointing the way which the most ardent admirers of Tasso and Ariosto were to follow.

His criticism of Spenser also distinguishes Hurd from his Augustan predecessors and marks him as a pioneer in the new and more romantic appreciation of the *Faerie Queene* which reached its culmination in the early years of the next century. In at least three important respects the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* represents a departure from the strict neo-classical attitude toward Spenser's masterpiece. The latter is featured by (1) an apparent lack of aesthetic appreciation of the imaginative element;[36] (2) a tendency to exalt its moral

[33] Letter IX.

[34] Hoole's translations of Tasso and Ariosto and the appreciative criticism of Montagu (*Essay on . . . Shakespeare*), Richardson (*Cursory Remarks on Tragedy*), Pinkerton (*Letters on Literature*), and Sherlocke (*Letters of an English Traveller*) came later than Hurd's treatise.

[35] William Collins, *Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland.*

[36] Hurd, however, was not the first eighteenth-century critic to evince an aesthetic appreciation of the *Faerie Queene.* An appreciation almost as strong is reflected in Thomas Warton's *Observations* and, earlier, in John Hughes' *Remarks on the Faerie Queene* (1715).

allegory; (3) a condemnation of Spenser for his disregard of classical rules, especially unity of action. Hurd did not judge the poem by standards of classical poetry but by the rules which governed its writing: it has "that sort of unity and simplicity, which results from its nature." (Letter VIII.) He did not condemn the imaginative element or regret that Spenser did not follow classical models; Spenser's fancies he believed to be more poetical for being Gothic. He did not exalt the allegory of the *Faerie Queene*; on the contrary, he declared the union of allegory and narrative to be "the only considerable defect in this extraordinary poem" (Letter VIII), and he tolerated and excused it only because, in his opinion, Spenser "had no better way to take in his distress than to hide his faery fancies under the mystic cover of moral allegory." (Letter XII.)

Among the critics who preceded him, Hurd had most in common with Thomas Warton. Warton, in his *Observations on the Faerie Queene* (1754), made the first genuine attempt to apply the principles of historical criticism. In consequence, he differed from the earlier critics, not only in relating the *Faerie Queene* to other literatures and to the life and manners of the chivalric age, but also, as Clarissa Rinaker points out,[37] in recognizing the inadequacy of the classical rules as standards in judging poetry and insisting that, since Spenser had not tried to write like Homer, he should be judged not by Homer's standards, but by his own. This approach to the *Faerie Queene* is the basis on which Hurd's justification of Spenser rests.

But Hurd carried the appreciation of Spenser much further than did Warton. He considered it as a Gothic composition and discovered in it a unity and order that Warton did not perceive. Warton regretted that Spenser did not follow Tasso rather than Ariosto; Hurd censured Tasso for choosing to "trim between the Gothic and classical models." Warton, in the first edition of his essay (the only one that preceded the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*) was not friendly to chivalric manners and Gothic superstitions; Hurd proclaimed them to be more poetical than the classic.

To the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* Herbert E. Cory attributes the origin of the "Epicurean" or "art for art's sake"

[37] *Thomas Warton,* University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 2 (1916). 43-46.

attitude in Spenser criticism.[38] This argument is not without foundation, but to draw a clear-cur distinction, as Mr. Cory does, between the Augustan attitude and Hurd's appreciation of Spenser's masterpiece, and to regard him as a representative of the "Triumph of Romanticism" and place him with Scott, Hazlitt, and Leigh Hunt is to overemphasize the points on which Hurd differed from the earlier critics and to overlook the Augustan features of his critique.

The historical importance of Hurd's study of Spenser must not be underestimated. The realization that the *Faerie Queene* should not be tested by classical rules is significant in a century when critics were endeavoring to find classical authority for romantic tales—when Addison was showing resemblances between the popular ballads and the *Aeneid,* when Blair was applying the rules of Aristotle to the poems of Ossian, when Spence and Upton were seeking to defend the *Faerie Queene* on classical grounds. The depreciation of Spenser's allegory and the appreciation of his imagination and the music of his poem contrast with the views of the Augustans. More characteristic of the nineteenth century than the eighteenth is the tribute:

> But all the Gods are ravish'd with delight
> Of his celestial song and music's wondrous might.[39]

But the author of the *Letters* does not disassociate himself completely from the Augustan viewpoint. There must be rules. If the "Gothic" poet cannot be required to conform to those of Aristotle and Horace, he must obey those that control his own system. Wherefore, Hurd devotes Letter VIII to a discussion of the method of a "Gothic" epic and the rules which govern it. In other words, to Hurd, as to the Augustans, form and structure—the art of poetry—are of first importance, and an appreciation of Spenser must rest, first of all, on a knowledge of Gothic rules and of Spenser's careful observance of them. So it is that a large portion of Hurd's critique is given over to a consideration of the structure of the *Faerie Queene.* Unlikc the critics of the next century, the author of the *Letters* cannot

[38] *The Critics of Edmund Spenser,* University of California Publications in Modern Philology 2 (1911). 173.

[39] Letter XII.

ignore matters fundamental in the Augustan conception of epic poetry.

Because Hurd's " learning and authoritative position counted for much " and because " everything with a Gothic flavor rose rapidly in public esteem " during the years after 1762, William Lyon Phelps concludes that " we must regard Hurd as a strong influence." [40] The popular reception accorded the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* [41] supports this conclusion and provides an additional reason for assuming that Hurd did, indeed, " accelerate the speed of the Romantic Movement." And yet an investigation of the direct influence of the *Letters* on the later studies of chivalry and the romances, on the new appreciation of Spenser, and on the vogue of the Italian poets discloses that the other critics of the century owed less to Hurd than might be supposed. In some cases the evidences of indebtedness are unmistakable; in many others the debt is uncertain.

A sympathetic interest in chivalry and a recognition of the true literary value of the romances are increasingly apparent after 1762, but the studies of chivalry draw quite as often on Sainte-Palaye,[42] who was well known in England, as on Hurd, and the studies of the romances, although their authors occasionally refer to Hurd, seldom reflect any considerable debt to the *Letters*. Two important exceptions are Thomas Warton and James Beattie.

[40] *The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement* (New York, 1893), p. 115.

[41] Six editions of the *Letters* were published in the eighteenth century: the first and second editions, 1762; the third, 1765; the fourth, 1771; the fifth, 1776; the sixth, 1788. If the number of editions be a criterion, it was one of Hurd's most popular works. Only the edition of Horace and the *Moral and Political Dialogues* approached it in popularity.

[42] Edward Gibbon, for instance, in his dissertation on chivalry gives credit to Sainte-Palaye (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* New York, 1844, 4. 121n); an anonymous article, " Hints Relating to Chivalry," in *The Bee* (April, 1793), is composed of quotations taken impartially from Hurd's *Letters* and Saint-Palaye's *Memoires*; Joseph Sterling opens his " enquiry into the essentials of chivalry " with the statement: " The excellent Curne de St. Palaye and the authors whom he quotes shall be my guides." ("A Dissertation on Chivalry," prefixed to *The History of the Chevalier Bayard,* Dublin, 1781, p. 3.) Hurd acknowledges Ste.-Palaye's *Memoires sur l'ancienne Chevalerie* as the source for his own information regarding chivalry. That he owed a greater debt to Chapelain is suggested by Professor Victor M. Hamm, "A Seventeenth-Century Source for Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance,*" PMLA 3 (1937). 820 ff.

That the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* was the principal source of Beattie's "Dissertation on Fable and Romance" (1783) is evident from a comparison of the two essays. Beattie was far less friendly than Hurd to the Middle Ages and their necromancy, and he objected to the old romances on the ground that "nature, probability, and even possibility were not much attended to"—an objection that shows his failure to perceive the true poetic value of the "fairy way of writing." Nevertheless, his dissertation and Hurd's *Letters* have much in common, including the fact that many of Beattie's points pertaining to the characteristics of chivalry were taken from Letters I and II of Hurd's discourse.[43]

In the second edition of his *Observations on the Faerie Queene* (1762), Thomas Warton took a somewhat more friendly attitude toward the Italian poets and their epic machinery than he had expressed in the first edition. He also recognized that the mediaeval romances are not merely interesting as a source of Spenser materials (Warton's earlier thought) but that they possess an intrinsic merit and that they "preserve many curious historical facts." These alterations bring Warton's views more nearly in line with Hurd's, but the short time that elapsed between the appearance of Hurd's treatise and Warton's *Observations* would have precluded any extensive changes in the latter as a result of the former discourse.[44]

Whatever may be the source of the *Observations,* the influence of Hurd on Warton's *History of English Poetry* is clear enough. The *History* repeats Hurd's conception of the close relationship between chivalry and the feudal system and includes remarks on the "Rime of Sir Thopas" which have been lifted bodily from the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance.* But far more significant than either of these evidences of indebtedness is the fact that Warton's *History* reflects a true appreciation of the imaginative appeal of Gothic customs and Gothic literature and defends them in terms that clearly indicate a debt to Hurd. Both critics stress the "truthfulness" of the romances, both emphasize the poetic values of their imaginative features, both believe the classical magic and mythology to be

[43] The borrowings are duly credited to Hurd in Beattie's footnotes.

[44] Hurd's discourse was published in May, 1762; Warton's second edition in August of the same year.

weak and ineffective as compared with the Gothic,[45] and both regret that truth and reason have deprived us of a "world of fine fabling." The last of these views Warton expresses in words almost identical with those of Hurd.[46]

Aside from the writing of Beattie and Warton, the eighteenth-century studies of chivalry and the romances appear to owe little or nothing to Hurd; rather they often disagree with many of his leading points. Two other studies of the romances, however, have a word of praise for him: Clara Reeve's *Progress of Romance* (1785) and John More's *View of the Commencement and Progress of Romance* (1797). But Clara Reeve, though she mentions Hurd as one of the "honourable exceptions" to her complaint that "the learned men of our country have affected a kind of contempt for this kind of writing,"[47] shows no influence of the *Letters,* and John More took little from Hurd. He quotes "the learned and elegant author of the *Letters on Chivalry*" as authority for his assertion that Shakespeare and Milton received assistance from Gothic ideas in working up some of their most striking and most terrible descriptions,[48] but he follows Warton, not Hurd, in his discussion of chivalry and the romances.

On the Spenser criticism of the eighteenth century, Hurd's

[45] Contrasting the two, Warton refers to the "colder magic" and "tamer mythology" of the ancients. (*History of English Poetry,* London, 1774, 2. 463.) Hurd had used the same terms in his *Letters.*

[46] Hurd says: "But reason, in the end . . . drove them [the tales of faery] off the scene, and would endure these *lying wonders,* neither in their own proper shape, nor as masked in figures. Henceforth, the taste of wit and poetry took a new turn: And *fancy* that had wantoned it so long in the world of fiction, was now constrained, against her will, to ally herself with strict truth, if she would gain admittance into reasonable company. What we have gotten by this revolution, you will say, is a great deal of good sense. What we have lost is a world of fine fabling." (Letter XII.) The italics are Hurd's.

The passage in Warton's *History* reads: "Setting aside the consideration of the more solid advantages, which are obvious and are not the distinct object of contemplation at present, the lover of true poetry will ask, what have we gained by this revolution? It may be answered, much good sense, good taste, and good criticism. But, in the meantime, we have lost a set of manners, and a system of machinery, more suitable to the purpose of poetry than those which have been adopted in their place. We have parted with extravagancies that are above propriety, with incredibilities that are more acceptable than truth, and with fictions that are more valuable than reality." (*History of English Poetry,* 1774 ed., 2. 463.)

[47] Preface to *The Progress of Romance* (The Facsimile Text Society, New York, 1930), p. xl.

[48] *Works* (London, 1820), 5. 18-19.

elaborate defense of the structure of the *Faerie Queene* appears to have had no direct influence. Actually, however, the most important offering of the *Letters* to the new " romantic " evaluation of Spenser's poem lies not in its demonstration that the work as a " Gothic " composition is perfectly regular in design, but in its aesthetic appreciation of the beauties of Spenser's " celestial song and music's wondrous might." In this, at least, Hurd, though not original, doubtless had a part in bringing critics to a more modern view of Spenser's genius. The influence is an intangible one, not easily traced and catalogued; but evidences of it are to be found in later critical discourses of the eighteenth century. Percival Stockdale, for instance, in his discussion of the structure of the *Faerie Queene*, follows and acknowledges indebtedness to Warton; yet he parts company with Warton and adopts Hurd's view when he objects to Spenser's allegory as " destructive of the very essence of true poetry," and stresses the power of Spenser's imagination and the beauty of his description.[49]

That Hurd, as a critic of Spenser, did not pass unregarded, whatever may have been the extent of his direct influence, is indicated by the fact that Henry James Todd included, in his edition of Spenser's works (1805), a passage from the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, along with excerpts from dissertations of Hughes, Upton, Spence, and Warton. In his preface, Todd mentions Hurd as one of the authors " to whose taste and learning the publick has paid the greatest deference "; and in his editorial comments on Hurd's dissertation, he credits the author with having " powerfully contributed to increase the number of Spenser's readers " and the *Letters* with having given " an additional vigour to the illustrations of preceding commentators, and confirmed the pretensions of the poem to its station in the highest class of literary production." [50]

Although Hurd's contribution to the appreciation of Tasso and Ariosto was important and, in some respects, original, the extent of his responsibility for the growing admiration of the *Jerusalem Delivered* and the *Orlando Furioso* is difficult to determine. After 1762 the Italian poets were so favorably regarded that, because of the absence of references to his *Letters*,

[49] *Lectures on the Truly Eminent English Poets* (London, 1807), 1. 16, 26.
[50] Todd's edition of Spenser (London, 1805), 2. clxxix.

direct influences of Hurd are not easily established. In one or two instances the debt is clear enough. It is particularly marked in Hoole's preface to his translation of the *Jerusalem Delivered* and in the *Monthly* reviewer's estimate of Hoole's volume.[51] Both followed Hurd in admiring the supernatural elements in Tasso's poem and in recognizing the poetic value of the Gothic mythology. Hoole also adopted Hurd's argument that the magic and enchantments of the old romances were as firmly believed in the Middle Ages as were the marvelous events of the classical epics in the days of Homer and Virgil.

An even more significant debt to Hurd is reflected in Hoole's assertion that " Gothic machines " are " more adapted to the great ends of epic poetry than the system of antiquity." [52] This view represents one of the few truly original contributions that the author of the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* has to offer. No one before him, not even the writers who had perceived the value to epic poetry of miraculous events and supernatural agents, had gone quite so far as to proclaim the Gothic system superior to the classical. Nor were the later critics willing to follow Hurd. Unlike the " romantic " appreciation of Spenser and the Italians, which grew steadily during the century, the belief that Gothic superstitions are superior to classical was seldom asserted. The few expressions of it, however, suggest that Hurd may have succeeded in bringing one or two critics to his view. Hoole, we may assume, took many points in his argument from Hurd, and the *Letters* may also have had an influence in forming Richardson's opinion that the Gothic systems seems " far more capable than all the fables of paganism of inspiring that enthusiastic fire which is the very soul of poetry." [53]

Direct influence of Hurd on William Mickle, Henry James Pye, and Thomas Twining is established by their quotations from and references to the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*. Mickle quotes and agrees with Hurd's statement: " Virgil's myrtles dropping blood are nothing to Tasso's enchanted forest." [54] Clearly he, like Hurd, perceived the poetic value of

[51] The *Monthly Review* 29 (November, 1763). 121.
[52] Preface to Hoole's translation of Tasso (London, 1802), xv. First ed., 1763.
[53] *Cursory Remarks on Tragedy* (London, 1774), p. 237.
[54] Introduction to Mickle's translation of the *Lusiad* (London, 1776), p. cxlvi.

marvelous occurrences. Pye, in his long commentary on Aristotle, left the Stagyrite long enough to admit the truth of Hurd's contention that Gothic superstitions are more horrible than those of the ancients.[55] Twining expresses agreement with Hurd's conception of imaginative truth [56] and the value of the marvelous and supernatural.[57]

What, then, is the significance of Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* in the history of eighteenth-century criticism? It came early in the revival of interest in the Middle Ages. In this "romantic" return to the past, Hurd's role was that of a pioneer. The critics were more reluctant than the poets to break with the Augustan tradition; as early as 1762, however, in the decade when Gray was finding inspiration in the Scandinavian mythology and Chatterton in the Middle Ages, when Macpherson was composing his poems of Ossian and Percy was collecting popular ballads, Hurd gave respectability to the poetry of "the ages we call barbarous" by proclaiming Gothic materials superior to classical as subjects for poetry and by expressing regret that an age of reason has destroyed "a world of fine fabling."

The changing taste in poetry and the substitution of new standards for old brought a re-valuation and a new appreciation of the more romantic features of the *Faerie Queene* and the Italian epics. In this movement, too, Hurd was a pioneer. As a critic of Spenser, he took much from Thomas Warton, who preceded him in protesting that Spenser's poem is not to be judged by classical rules. But the importance of the *Letters* in Spenser criticism is not that the author attempts to derive "Gothic" rules by which the poet can be justified; rather, its significance is that Hurd recognizes that the excellence of the *Faerie Queene* is not to be attributed primarily to its structure, far less to its moral allegory, but to more romantic qualities—the power of Spenser's imagination and the music of his verse. This it was that recommended Hurd's critique to his contemporaries. Much the same is true of Hurd's contribution to the growing appreciation of the Italian poets. He confined his support of their epics to a defense of the more imaginative

[55] *A Commentary Illustrating the Poetics of Aristotle* (London, 1792), p. 275.
[56] *Aristotle's Treatise of Poetry* (London, 1789), Introduction, pp. xv-xvi.
[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.

elements in their work more than had previous critics, and, for this reason, he was one of the first to accord proper recognition to Ariosto.

Most important of all is Hurd's emphasis on the value of imagination. As early as 1762 he distinguished between the world of fact and the poet's world where "all is marvellous and extraordinary," where "experience has less to do than consistent imagination"; and urged the right of poetry to surpass the bounds of truth and possibility.[58]

The George Washington University

[58] Samuel H. Monk regards this as a significant contribution in the history of the sublime. Referring to Hurd's conception of imaginative truth, Monk says: "Imaginative truth, not the rules, is the sole test for poetry, and imaginative truth, even when it contains the impossible, is sublime. . . . With the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* and the advent of Ossian, so far as taste goes, the sublime had become a power-factor in pre-romanticism." (*The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England*, MLA, General Series, 1935, p. 106.)

VITA

Audley Lawrence Smith was born in Washington County, Iowa, February 6, 1899. He received his elementary education in the public schools of Long Beach, California, and Menlo and Des Moines, Iowa, and was graduated from the Moravia, Iowa, High School in 1916. He attended The George Washington University from 1919 to 1924 and did further graduate work at The Johns Hopkins University, supplemented by study in the summer sessions of Columbia University and the University of Chicago. He received the degrees of Bachelor of Arts (1923) and Master of Arts (1924) from The George Washington University and Doctor of Philosophy (1938) from The Johns Hopkins University. Since 1924 he has been a member of the faculty of The George Washington University where he has served as Instructor in English, 1924-1928; Assistant Professor of English, 1928-1938; and Associate Professor of English, 1938 ——.